

MILITARY POSTURE & STRATEGY

Sec. Haig 23 Feb 81 Interview on French Television (DC)

(Soviet Strategic Superiority)

QUESTION (Interpreter): Do you think that the Soviet Union has a nuclear advantage at the present time, today?

SECRETARY HAIG: Well, I think it is very hard for any, even the most qualified of objective observers, to make the kind of value judgments your question anticipates. I think, basically, most of the experts accept that we are at a point of relative balance and equivalence. But these same experts are gravely concerned that the momentum in the Soviet nuclear building program is such that in a very brief period, perhaps by the middle of this coming decade, that equality will shift rapidly to Soviet superiority. This is a matter of grave concern to all of us, and certainly to President Reagan, who as you know, has dedicated himself to a substantial build-up in American capabilities, not exclusively in the nuclear area, of course.

QUESTION (Interpreter): But the United States, are you seeking nuclear parity or do you want to recover superiority?

SECRETARY HAIG:: I think these terms, superiority, number one, equality, generate emotional responses from well-meaning people that suggest to me that they can be counter-productive. They are much like the term "Domino Theory" of a few years ago, as we refer to the events in Southeast Asia.

I think what we need is adequacy in the context of Western capabilities. Adequacy means that we can effectively counter-balance Soviet existing inventories and, above all, that we make it clear that a preemptive first strike on the part of the Soviet Union would result in unacceptable risks to their leadership, so they would never consider the advantages of such a strike.

Pres. Reagan 13 Mar 81 Statement by the President

(National Defense Stockpile)

I am today directing the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to begin the first purchase program for the national defense stockpile of strategic and critical materials in over 20 years. These purchases of strategic materials, estimated initially at \$100 million, are a step to restructure the existing \$15 billion stockpile in critical areas of deficiency.

It is now widely recognized that our

Nation is vulnerable to sudden shortages in basic raw materials that are necessary to our defense production base. Our vulnerabilities have been highlighted in a number of congressional hearings and panels concerning the industrial base. Thus, this overdue addition to our stockpile constitutes a necessary hedge against any supply disruptions.

In addition to strategic stockpiling, I

am considering other measures to decrease the Nation's vulnerability, including ways to expand domestic capacity to produce strategic and critical materials. This acquisition program is a necessary first step. It is expected that larger purchases will be made as funds from sales of excess materials build up in the stockpile fund.

Selected Statements

Pres. Reagan

16 Mar 81

Q & A Session with Congressional Women (DC)

(Regional Defense Spending)

Q. Mr. President, I want to thank you for having us. I represent Cleveland, Ohio, the scene of your debate victory. And I was very pleased in the debate when you talked about and mentioned the inequities of poor women in the social security system, and I think millions of American women were. My focus of concern, of course, is older women and, in particular, problems that the Northeast and the Midwest are experiencing. In the State of Ohio, Mr. President, we get only 71 cents out of the dollar back to our State. And I'm wondering, if we go to a block grant approach to the States, like my own State, can we be assured that we'll get our share of jobs in the defense area and in energy and so on that by-and-large would help our State of Ohio and other Midwestern and Northeastern States? And then we'd have the money on a State level to do the kinds of things that you're suggesting we

ought to be doing on a local area. Is there any concentration on bringing more jobs to our States so that we get one dollar for every dollar in taxation we give to the Federal Government?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I have to say with regard to jobs of that kind, and government jobs, that we think the whole program is geared at the kind of jobs that really count, and that is the revitalization of industry, the renewal of industry. And I know that Ohio is hurt worse than a great many States represented here today. Your unemployment rate is way above the national average. But that's true also of Michigan and several other of the industrial States. And the whole function of the program is geared to increasing productivity, making it possible for business and industry to invest the capital that is necessary to be able to compete once again with our foreign competitors. So that part

will have—whether you can substitute with defense spending—actually there, I think, the first rule is what is the best and most efficient and economical way to build up our defenses.

I think that too often in the past we have confused military spending with, let's say, trying to attain a social aim at the same time. Now, I can see if there are two States or three States, that any one of them is in a position to meet the military contract, then I think you've got to use some fairness and honesty in spreading it around. But it is true that there are some States that are just heavier in defense—States along the coast with shipbuilding yards and so forth. And I can only say we try to be fair with the other. But the real thing that you need is the private industry put back on its feet to provide that kind of job for the people.

Pres. Reagan

29 Mar 81

Interview with Washington Post (DC)

(MX Basing Mode)

Q. A number of leaders from western states, including some of your strong supporters, oppose the MX fixed-rail siting because it's going to use up so much range land. How do you feel about that?

A. I have to tell you that, while I can't claim that I've had enough input to make a final decision on anything. I'm not enamored of that fixed-rail system. I believe the missile is necessary. I don't believe in the basing method that has been suggested so far.

Q. Because of the land use?

A. It's not only that. It's so elaborate, so costly, and I'm not sure that it is necessary or would be effective. It's again an indication of this whole effort, such as in the SALT talks, to have verifiability so you create a great, elaborate costly system in which you can hide the missile except that the enemy has to know that the missile is there. And it doesn't make much sense to me.

Q. Does that mean that the sea-based op-

tion is under active consideration?

A. Oh, I think there are any number of them, ranging all the way from silos such as we presently have. Silo, sea-based, they're all being looked at.

Q. So the siting question. You've been committed to the missile, but the siting of it is still a wide-open question as far as you're concerned?

A. Yes.

Sec. Weinberger

29 Mar 81

ABC -- Issues and Answers

(CIA Report on Terrorism)

MR. DUNSMORE: Mr. Secretary, there's a report in the press today that there is a draft C.I.A. report, in which the C.I.A. is unable to find substantial evidence to support the Administration's claim that the Soviets are behind international terrorism. Can you enlighten us at all on that?

SECRETARY WEINBERGER: Well, I don't know if enlighten is the right word. I can certainly talk about it a little bit, because the report in the newspaper is one of these reports of a very preliminary draft of the thinking of some of the people. It has specifically not been issued, and it doesn't constitute the final judgment of the C.I.A.

I think, as far as I can make out, because I've not seen it and quite properly so, because apparently it is just a draft, the newspapers have the advantage of me on that, and they have seen it, and what they report is, or at least they have seen something that enables them to write the story, and the story is that on an individual basis, taking a particular piece of evidence, they say this particular piece of evidence doesn't seem to be supportive. But on the other hand, although the headline didn't say it -- the story did -- there are some pieces of evidence in which this draft reports that there is substantiation.

I myself have no doubt that there is good, clear evidence that the Soviets have been participating in the training and in the equipping of groups that, for want of a better term, can be called terrorist groups, groups that are bent upon overthrowing governments that are basically friendly to us and establishing groups within countries that have the potential for overthrowing governments, so that it's really a question of degree, whether all of the evidence is supportive or whether only some of it is supportive. So I think any suggestion that the C.I.A. has found that the Soviets are not behind the training, equipping and encouraging of international terrorism would not only be very premature, it would be quite wrong.